PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 100111406-2

In The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

In Re the Application of:

OCT 2 6 2006

Inventor(s):

Wolfgang BROSS et al.

Confirmation No.: 9508

....

Serial No.:

09/995,320

Examiner: Garcia Ade

Filed:

November 26, 2001

Group Art Unit:

3627

Title:

METHODS, DATA RECORD, SOFTWARE INTERFACE, DATA WAREHOUSE MODULE AND SOFTWARE APPLICATION FOR

EXCHANGING TRANSACTION-TAX-RELATED DATA

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TO THE USPTO

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on October 26, 2006. This correspondence contains the following document(s):

I shoot of Transmittal of Appeal Brief (2 copies).

17 sheets of Appeal Brief-Patents.

Respectfully submitted,

MANNAVA & KANG, P.C.

October 26, 2006

Timothy B. Kang

Reg. No.: 46,423

MANNAVA & KANG, P.C. 8221 Old Courthouse Road

Suite 104

Vienna, VA 22182 (703) 652-3817

(703) 865-5150 (facsimile)

Intellectual Property Administration P. O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

100111406-2 HECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

OCT 2 6 2006

Inventor(s):

Wolfgang BROSS et al.

Confirmation No.: 9508

PATENT APPLICATION

Application No.:09/995,320

Examiner: Garcia Ade

Filing Date:

Nov. 26, 2001

Group Art Unit: 3627

Title:

METHODS, DATA RECORD, SOFTWARE INTERFACE, DATA WAREHOUSE MODULE

AND SOFTWARE APPLICATION FOR EXCHANGING TRANSACTION-TAX-RELATED

DATA

Mall Stop Appeal Brief-Patents **Commissioner For Patents**

PO Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is the Appeal Brief in this application with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on <u>August 2, 2006</u>

The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is (37 CFR 1.17(c)) \$500.00.

(complete (a) or (b) as applicable)

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) apply.

()	(a) Applicant petitions for an extension of time under	37 CFR 1.136 (fees:	37 CFR 1.17(a)-(d)
	for the total number of months checked below:	,	

one month \$120.00) two months \$450,00) three months \$1020.00 () four months \$1590.00

() The extension fee has already been filled in this application.

(X) (b) Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

Please charge to Deposit Account 08-2025 the sum of \$500.00 . At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

() I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. Date of Deposit: OR

(X) I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number_(571)_273-8300_____ on __Oct_28_2006

Timothy B. Kand

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Respectfully submitted,

Wolfgang BROSS et al.

Number of pages: 20

Reg. No. 46,423

Typed Name: Judy H. Chune

PAGE 2/9 * RCVD AT 10/26/2006 5:41:24 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-5/15 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:703 865 5150 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-24

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER Docket No.: 100111406-2

OCT 2 6 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s):

Wolfgang BROSS et al.

Confirmation No.: 9508

Serial No.:

09/995,320

Examiner: Garcia Ade

Filed:

November 26, 2001

Group Art Unit:

3627

Title:

METHODS, DATA RECORD, SOFTWARE INTERFACE, DATA WAREHOUSE MODULE AND SOFTWARE APPLICATION FOR

EXCHANGING TRANSACTION-TAX-RELATED DATA

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

<u> APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS</u>

Sir:

This is an Appeal Brief in connection with the decisions of the Examiner in an Office Action dated May 2, 2006 and in response to the Notice of Panel Decision from Pre-Appeal Brief Review dated September 26, 2006. It is respectfully submitted that the present application has been more than twice rejected. Each of the topics required in an Appeal Brief and a Table of Contents are presented herewith and labeled appropriately.

OCT 26,2006

PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 100111406-2 App. Scr. No.: 09/995,320

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(1)	Real Party In Interest	3		
(2)	Related Appeals And Interferences	_3		
(3)	Status Of Claims	3		
(4)	Status of Amendments	3		
(5)	Summary Of Claimed Subject Matter	3		
(6)	Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal	5		
(7)	Arguments	6		
A.	The rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.	,		
as l	ocing indefinite is improper	6		
В.	The provisional rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 10-13 on the ground of non-			
stat	tutory obviousness-type double patenting is improper7			
C.	The rejection of claims 1, 3, 5-8, and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being			
unp	patentable over Sullivan in view of Cox et al	_8		
(8)	Conclusion	10		
(9)	Claim Appendix	12		
(10)	Evidence Appendix	16		
α	Related Proceedings Appendix	17		

PATENT Atty Docket No.: 100111406-2

App. Ser. No.: 09/995,320

(1) Real Party In Interest

The real party in interest is Hewlett-Packard Development Company, L.P.

(2) Related Appeals And Interferences

There are no other appeals or interferences related to this case.

(3) Status Of Claims

Claims 1, 3, 5-8, and 10-13 are pending and rejected. All pending claims are hereby appealed.

(4) Status of Amendments

No amendment was filed subsequent to the final Office Action dated May 2, 2006.

(5) Summary Of Claimed Subject Matter

According to one embodiment in claim 1, there is provided a computer-based method performed in a first transaction-tax-related application of a first program controlled apparatus, the method comprising:

exchanging transaction-related data with at least a second transaction-tax-related application of a second program controlled apparatus according to a standardized transaction-tax interface data model, wherein the standardized transaction-tax interface data model provides an interface model which enables communications between the first transaction-tax-

PATENT Atty Docket No.: 100111406-2
App. Ser. No.: 09/995,320

related application and the second transaction-tax-related application (see at least paragraph starting on line 22, p. 6; FIG. 5a, 512); and

wherein the first transaction-tax-related application uses a first application-specific data model different from the standardized transaction-tax interface data model, the method further comprising mapping data elements of the first application-specific data model to data elements of the standardized transaction-tax interface data model, or vice versa (see at least paragraph starting on line 22, p. 6; FIG. 5a, 512), the mapping includes,

reading an output mapping definition;

deriving source information from the data elements of the first application-specific data model based on the read output mapping definition; and mapping the source information to the data elements of the standardized transaction-tax interface model (see at least paragraph starting on line 10, p. 20; FIG. 5d, 500).

According to another embodiment in claim 7, there is provided a computer-based method performed in a transaction-tax-related data warehouse application, the method comprising:

storing transaction-related data received from at least one transaction-tax-related application in a data warehouse of a program controlled apparatus according to a standardized transaction-tax data warehouse data model (see at least paragraph starting on line 13, p. 23; FIG. 5e, 590);

providing a standardized transaction-tax interface data model as an interface model which enables communications between the transaction-tax-related data warehouse application and the at least one transaction-tax-related application, the standardized

PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 100111406-2

App. Ser. No.: 09/995,320

transaction-tax interface data model being different from the standardized transaction-tax data warehouse data model (see at least paragraph starting on line 13, p. 23; FIG. 5e, 590);

mapping transaction-tax-related data elements in a set of transaction-tax-related data elements in the tax-related data warehouse data model with transaction-tax-related data elements in a set of transaction-tax-related data elements in the standardized transaction-tax interface data model, the set of transaction-tax-related data elements of the standardized transaction-tax data warehouse data model comprises at least one of, equals and is a subset of the set of transaction-tax-related data elements of a standardized transaction-tax interface data model; wherein the mapping includes,

reading an output mapping definition;

deriving source information from the data elements in the tax-related data warehouse data model based on the read output mapping definition; and mapping the source information to the data elements in the standardized transaction-tax interface data model (see at least line 8, p. 25 to line 32, p. 30; FIG. 5d, 528, 552, 554).

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

- a) Whether claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 10-13 should have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.
- b) Whether claims 1, 3, 5-8, and 10-13 should have been provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting.

PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 100111406-2 App. Ser. No.: 09/995,320

c) Whether claims 1, 3, 5-8, and 10-13 should have been rejected under 35 H S C.